A

LETTER,

Written upon the

DISCOVERY

Of the Late

PLOT.

Licensed W. Jane, *Octob.* 17. 1678.

LONDON:
Printed for *H. Brome*, and *R. Chiswell*, both living in St. *Paul's Church-Yard*, 1678.

BODLEIAN LIBRARY
2 JUN 1937

A

LETTER,

Written upon the DISCOVERY

Of the Late

PLOT.

SIR,

I Heartily thank you for the News your laſt brought me, of the diſcovery of that horrid Plot, both againſt his Majeſties Perſon, and the whole Kingdom. I doubt not but all good men are offering up their acknowledgments to God, for ſo great a Bleſſing; which is a freſh demonſtration of his care of this Church, and State: and that all our Crying ſins have not provoked him yet to abandon us: of which I pray God make us all ſenſible, that we may not continue to pull down ſuch judgments, as the malice of wicked men would readily become inſtrumental in, if the Providence of God did not ſo wonderfully and ſeaſonably interpoſe.

There is only one Paſſage in your Letter, that I wonder at. You tell me every body is ſurprized with this Plot now diſcovered. I confeſs I am not of their mind; for although I know there are perſons of high Honour, and untainted Loyalty of the Roman Religion, who abominate the thoughts of all ſecret Aſſaſſinations, much more of

Murdering his Majeſty; yet ſuch practices are ſo neceſſarily conſequent to the Principles of that Church, that no Member of it, who throughly underſtands them, can, while they continue in that Communion, avoid the being involved in Conſpiracies, as oft as a fit occaſion preſents it ſelf.

Theſe ſeveral years paſt they have boaſted much of their Loyalty, and their Services and Sufferings for his Majeſty, during the late Civil Wars. All this was neceſſary to make the Government put confidence in them, that ſo they might more ſecretly lay their deſigns: which were to take effect, when a Conjuncture was offered that ſeemed favourable. But I muſt again and again repeat, what I often told you in diſcourſe; That no Member of that Church can thorowly underſtand and believe the Principles of it, and be a good Subject even to a King of his own Perſwaſion: But he can be much leſs ſo, to a Prince whom he looks on as an Heretick, who thereby lies under a general Excommunication, and may be brought under a particular and Formal one, before he, or any body elſe, but ſuch as are fit to be entruſted with the Secret, ſhall know it: And then the Prince is at the mercy of all his Popiſh Subjects, who if they conſider aright the Doctrine of their own Church, muſt depart from their Allegiance to Him, and be ready to do any thing that is laid on them, by thoſe who are either directly their Superiours, if they have taken Religious Vows; or at leaſt, have ſome authority over their Conſciences.

This I ſhall open to you in as ſhort and plain terms as is poſſible; and the rather, that you may communicate it to ſome perſons of Honour of that Religion, who I hope upon ſo freſh a Diſcovery of theſe practices, may be now not unwilling to examine a Point, the conſideration of which they before rejected, as an Imputation caſt on their Religion. This will now, I imagine, move them ſo far to demur, as to conſider impartially whether ſuch practiſes flow only from

from the ill Tempers of particular Perſons, or from the received Principles of their Church. This latter I undertake to make out, from the undeniable Maximes, to which all of that Communion are bound to adhere.

There are Two Principles, which I may well call the Fundamental Principles of the *Roman* Church: ſince all Opinions that are not inconſiſtent with them, can be tollerated among them: But whatever ſtrikes at theſe, muſt needs be Abominated, as Deſtructive of that, they call *The Catholick Faith.* The one is, *The Authority of the Church,* The other is, *The Certainty of Tradition.* If then the Doctrine of Depoſing Kings, and by conſequence Killing them (for if they are juſtly depoſed, it's as juſt to kill them as to kill any Uſurper) is ſuch, that without denying the Authority of the Church, and the Certainty of Tradition, it cannot be denied; then all men muſt reſolve either to acknowledg it, or to renounce their Subjection to a Church that muſt needs believe it.

About the Authority of the Church, Two things are to be obſerved, that ſerve for clearing what I deſign to make out.

The Firſt is, That the Church in any one Age has as much Authority as ever it had, or can have in any other Age: For if Chriſts Promiſes, together with the other Arguments they bring for the Authority of the Church, be good, they are alike ſtrong at all Times, and in all Ages: And therefore though in writing Books of Controverſies they muſter up Authorities out of the former Ages, becauſe we profeſs we pay little eſteem to the latter Ages: Yet among themſelves all Ages are alike, and the Decrees of them are of equal authority.

Secondly, The Authority of the Church is as little to be diſputed in moral matters, that fall under practice, as in Articles of Faith that only fall under Speculation, and in a word,

word, The Church must be the Infallible Expounder of the Ten Commandments, as well as of the Creed. All the Arguments from Christs Promises, from the hazard of trusting to our private Reasonings, and the Necessity of Submitting to a publick Judg, are by so much the more concluding in Practical matters, as it is of more Importance, That Men think aright in Practical than in Speculative Opinions. If then there arises a Question about a Moral matter, or the Exposition of any of the Commandments, The only certain Decision must be expected from the Church. For instance, a Question arises about Images, Whether it is lawful to use them in the Worship of God, upon the seeming Opposition which the worship of them has to the 2d Commandment? Since the Church has once Determin'd that it may be lawfully used, it is Heresie to deny it, on this pretence, that we fancy it is contrary to one of the Commandments. So if a Controversie arise upon the Fifth Commandment, How far a King is to be acknowledged, if the Church has determined the Limits of that, it is Heresie to carry it further. If also another Question arise how much the Sixth Commandment obliges? It must be carried so far and no further than the Determination of the Church allows. I confess by the Doctrine of that Church, even a General Council may err in a point in which any matter of Fact is included: Because they may be deceived by a false Information. But in a General Rule about Morality, and the Extent of any of the Ten Commandments, The Decision of the Church must either be certain, and for ever Obligatory, or the whole Doctrine of the Infallibility of the Church falls to the ground.

Concerning the *Certainty of Tradition*, the general Opinion of that party, is, That Tradition is an Infallible Conveyance of Divine Truth: and that whatever any Age of the Church delivers to another as derived from Christ and his Apostles,

Apoſtles, muſt be received with the ſame Veneration and Obedience that we pay to the Holy Scriptures. And for the ways of diſtinguiſhing a Tradition of the Church from any Impoſture, or Novelty: There be four of them.

The firſt, That is the moſt doubtful, is, That the greateſt and moſt eſteemed Doctors in any Age deliver as a Divine Truth. Nor is it neceſſary that they formally ſay, This is a Tradition: but if many of them mention an Opinion, and declare their own aſſent to it, this paſſes as a ſufficient proof of the Tradition of any Age of the Church. So in all points of Controverſie between them and us, the greateſt part of their Writers, (ſome few later and ſuſpected ones only excepted) think they have ſufficiently juſtified their Church, when they bring Teſtimonies out of any of the Writings of the Fathers, that ſeem to favour their Opinion: and will call it unreaſonable for us to reject theſe, becauſe they only deliver their own opinion, and do not call it the Tradition of the Church, but conclude, That many Writers in any age aſſerting an Opinion, it may well be looked on as the Tradition of that Age.

But, becauſe this is more liable to exception, there is another way, that is more infallible to judg of Tradition: and that is, by the conveyance of the See of *Rome*, which they judg the chief Depoſitory of the Faith; and for which they fanſie they have ſo many proofs, from the high things ſome of the Fathers have ſaid about the dignity of that See. Now if theſe conclude any thing, it muſt follow, That whatever has been delivered in any Age by a Pope, as conveyed down from Chriſt, or his Apoſtles, muſt either be ſo indeed, or the See of *Rome* is not a faithful Tranſmitter of Tradition.

But, there is yet a more certain way of judging of Tradition, by what the chief Paſtors of the Church have delivered, when aſſembled in a general Council. This being the

Supreme

Supreme Tribunal in the Church, there can lie no appeal from it: Nor can the Doctrines delivered or approved by it be queſtioned. For inſtance, If it were under debate, How the Tradition about Tranſubſtantiation can be made out in the Thirteenth Century; it is needleſs to ſeek any other evidence, than, That one *Almerick* is condemned for denying it, and in Oppoſition to that, it was formally eſtabliſhed in a general Council. This is as much as can be had, and he were very unreaſonable that were not ſatisfied with it: So if it be asked, How can the Tradition of the Doctrine of Depoſing Kings, and giving away their Dominions in the ſame Century be proved? The Anſwer is plain, That ſame very Council decreed it: Upon which a great Prince was depoſed, and his Dominions were given to another.

Theſe are the Common Standards by which Traditions are Examined. But to theſe a new one has been lately added: which is indeed a much ſhorter and nearer way: And that is, whatever the Church holds in any one age, as a Material point of Religion, ſhe muſt have received it from the former age, and that age from the former, and ſo it climbs upwards till the days of the Apoſtles. If this be a certain Track of Tradition by which we may infallibly trace it; Then for inſtance, If in any one age, it hath been believed, That St. *Peter* had power from Chriſt, which he left to the See of *Rome*, by which his Succeſſor in it can depoſe Kings, then this muſt be an Apoſtolical Tradition, and by conſequence of equal authority with any thing written in the Scriptures.

To theſe General Conſiderations about the Authority of the Church, and the Certainty of Tradition; I ſhall add Two other, about the Nature of Supreme and Soveraign Power: By which we may judg of what Extent the Popes Power muſt be, if he have an authority to depoſe Kings, and transfer their Dominions to other perſons.

Firſt,

First, When the Soveraign Powers proceed in a Legal way againſt its Subjects; If either they abſcond, ſo that they cannot be found; Or have ſuch a Power about them, that the Sovereign cannot bring them to puniſhment; He may declare them Rebels, and ſet Prices on their Heads; And in that caſe it is as lawful for any Subject to kill them, as it is for an Executioner to put a condemned Perſon to Death. Theſe being the ſeveral ways the Law provides in thoſe ſeveral caſes. So when a *Pope* depoſes a Prince, He may as lawfully ſet on private Aſſaſſinates to kill him, as oblige his Subjects to riſe with open force againſt him. For if the *Pope* has a Power over him to depoſe him; this clearly follows from the Nature of Sovereign Power, and it is the Courſe that ſometimes muſt be followed, when the Rebel can be no other way brought to deſerved puniſhment; and if the *Pope* has the power of depoſing, then a Prince who after ſuch a Sentence, carries himſelf as a King, is a Rebel againſt his Supreme Lord: And is alſo an Uſurper. For his Title being deſtroyed by the Sentence, He has no authority over his Subjects: and therefore may be as lawfully killed as any Rebel or Uſurper.

Secondly, The Supreme power may in caſes of great neceſſity, when the thing is in it ſelf materially juſt, paſs over ſuch Forms as ought in ordinary Caſes to be obſerved. I need not tell you, That in a great Fire, Subordinate Magiſtrates may blow up Houſes. But doubtleſs the Supreme Power of all, as a King in an abſolute Monarchy (and ſuch is the Papal Power if theſe Opinions be true) may diſpence with ſome Forms, when the Matter is in it ſelf juſt; and if the chief deſign of a Law be purſued, the circumſtantial parts of it may upon extraordinary occaſions be ſuperſeded: Therefore, if the *Pope* is Supreme over all Kings, and has this depoſing Power; Then though by the Canon, a King ought to be firſt a Year Excommunicated for his Hereſy

or favouring Hereticks; and at the Years end he may be Depoſed by the Pope, (There are alſo other Rules for Excommunications, tho the Summary way in ſome caſes may be uſed) yet all theſe are but circumſtantial and leſſer Matters. The deſign of that Law, is, That no Heretical Prince, or favourer of Hereſie, be continued in his Power; The other, are but Forms of Law, that cannot be indiſpenſibly neceſſary in all caſes. Beſides, the very Canon Law teaches, that when there is both a *Notorietas juris & Facti*, Summary proceedings are Legal; when then it is Notorious, that the Doctrines of the Church (of *England* for Inſtance) are Heretical, and that the King is an Obſtinate Favourer of theſe Hereſies, and will not extirpate them, Summary and Secret proceedings are juſtifiable. There is no hope that Bulls, Breves, or Citations would do any good in this caſe: Theſe would on the contrary, alarm the State, and bring all the Party under great hazards: Therefore from the Nature of Supreme Power, it is moſt juſtly Inferred, That though there have been no publick Sentence of Depoſition (according to the Forms of the Canon Law) yet all theſe may be diſpenſed with, and a Secret and Summary one may do as well.

Theſe Poſitions are ſuch, that I cannot fanſie any juſt Exceptions to which they are liable; and from all theſe laid together, the Inference will undeniably follow: That according to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, the power of Depoſing Kings is lodged with the Pope, by a Divine Authority; and that, by conſequence, private perſons may conſpire to take away the Life of a King ſo depoſed: Even though there be no publick Sentence given about it. But before I bring the Evidence for all this, I ſhall deſire the Reader will a little reflect on the Poſitions I have laid down: in which he will find an Anſwer to all the Exceptions, that can be made againſt the following Evidence.

By the first, The Authority of the Church, being the same in all Ages; he will see it is to no purpose to pretend these were dark Ages: So that what was done in an ignorant time, cannot oblige the World when things are seen in a better light. But if the Church has an Authority from Christ, that shall last till the end of the World, it must be the same in all ages. The Ignorance of the age is a very good answer when made by a Protestant, but can signifie nothing in a *Papists* Mouth.

By the second, Of the Churches authority in setling Moral Rules for practice, it appears how fond that distinction is, which they make between a Canon and a Decree. It is true, a Decree about a particular Case, in which there is some matter of Fact, may be wrong according to their Principles, and yet the authority of the Church remain entire. For instance, in the deposing a Prince, or condemning a Man for Heresie, the Church may either by false Witnesses, or mistaking a Man's words, be drawn to pass an unjust Sentence, by reason of a mis representation of the Fact. But that is nothing to the purpose here, where a Decree is made as a perpetual Rule of Practice; this must be of the same authority of a Canon about any article of Faith. Otherwise it will follow, that the Church may mislead the People in matters indispensably necessary to Salvation: For such is the Obedience to the Ten Commandments.

By the first way of judging of the Tradition of the Church, from what the most received Writers in any age deliver, as the Doctrine of the Church, it will appear; That the Schoolmen and Canonists are as competent Conveyers of Tradition from the twelfth age downward, as the Fathers were from the sixth Age upward; and laying this for a Principle, That the Church is the same in all Ages, they are really more competent Witnesses than the Fathers were. First, Because they write more closely to the subject they

have in hand; they consider what is said for, or against an Opinion in a more exact manner, than the Fathers did, who being carried with the heat they are sometimes in, go off from the purpose: and generally affect Eloquence, which is the most improper Stile for nice Matters: Whereas the Schoolmen write in a blunt way, only considering the purpose they are about, coyning the most barbarous words they can light on, when they think them the fittest to express their Notions. Secondly, They were divided into two famous Schools, among whom there were great heats, the *Scotists* and *Thomists*: So that if either of these had asserted any thing that was not the received Doctrine of the Age they lived in, the other Party had such Emulation against them, that they would not have failed to have laid them open: as they did in the matter of the Immaculate Conception of the B. Virgin. Whereas the Fathers writing only against Hereticks, or other Enemies to Christianity, they might have mistaken some things, without so publick a discovery as was likely to happen among the Schoolmen. 3dly. The Schoolmen wrote on purpose to deliver the Doctrine of the *Age* in which they lived, to those who were to succeed them. Their Books being generally the Divinity Lectures they read, either in Colledges or Religious Houses, to their Scholars, whereas the Fathers wrote upon Emergent Occasions, either Letters or Treatises to private Persons, regarding more the present, than the succeeding Age. In which we cannot expect that exactness, that is to be looked for in a Publick Lecture. Upon all which I assume, That allowing the Church to have the same Authority in all *Ages*, the Schoolmen are more competent Witnesses of the Tradition of the Church in their *Ages*, than the Fathers were in theirs.

By the second Rule for judging of Traditions, from the Conveyance of the See of *Rome*, it does undeniably follow,

low, That the Popes from *Gregory* the Sevenths time downward, were as ſure *Depoſitories* of the Traditions of the Church, as were the Popes from *Gregory* the Firſt his time upward. They were both alike Chriſt's Vicars, and St. *Peters* Succeſſors. So that all the high words that the Fathers beſtow on the See of *Rome*, were either Complements, in which they are not wanting, or were ſaid becauſe of the worth of the Biſhops, whom they had known in that See. But if they be to be underſtood in that ſence in which the Writers of Controverſy obtrude them on us, then it will follow manifeſtly, that as to the Conveyance of Tradition, P. *Gregory* the 7th is as much to be believed, when he ſays any thing in the Name of *St. Peter*, or of Chriſt, as any of the Popes are. For in the Preamble of Bulls and Breeves, the Reaſons are given of what follows, which are moſt commonly vouched from Apoſtolical Authority and Tradition. So let the Pope be ever ſo ignorant, or ſo corrupt in his Manners, what he aſſerts to be Apoſtolical Tradition, muſt be either received as ſuch, or the authority of that See is overthrown: therefore they muſt either ceaſe to preſs us any more with tht *Authority* of the See of *Rome*, or acknowledg that all the Popes Declarations, which they make about Traditions, are to be received. It is an Anſwer to be made uſe of only to ignorant Perſons, to ſay, Theſe *Depoſitions* were the Deeds of ſome Popes, who might be ill Men, and the Church is not concerned to juſtify them. I confeſs, whether this or that Depoſition was juſtly or lawfully made, is a perſonal thing, in which only the Pope who decreed it is concerned. But if he declares in the Preamble, that the Power of depoſing upon thoſe reaſons, is grounded on an *Apoſtolical* Tradition, then the See is concerned in it: for either he declares true or falſe; if the former, then that Power of depoſing comes from *Apoſtolical Tradition*; if they acknowledge

he

he declares false, then we are not any more to be urged with the Authority of that See, as the certain Depository of the Traditions of the Church.

By the third Mark, to judge of the Tradition of any age from the Decision of a General Council, it appears, that the Decisions of the fourth Council of *Lateran* are as Obligatory as the Decrees of the first Council of *Nice*: the Church having the same power in all Ages. If it be said, it was only a Council of the Western Church, the like may be objected against the first General Council, which were generally made up of Eastern Bishops, and very few of the Western Bishops sat in them. And if we esteem a Council *General*, because it was received by the Church, then the whole Church of *Rome* having received that Council, it must be acknowledged to be *General* as much as any ever was. But to this, others answer, That a Council is only Infallible, when a thing is decreed by it according to the Tradition of the Church. If this be true, the whole Controversie between the *Roman* Church and us, about the authority of Councils, is decided on our Side. For if a Council has only authority to declare Traditions, then it is free for every Person to examine, whether this Declaration be according to truth or not? And if it be found that it is not so, they may lawfully reject such Decisions. For instance in the second Council of *Nice*, the worship of Images was established upon a mock-shew of Tradition: and yet all the World knows, there were no Images allowed in the Church the first four Ages after *Christ*; and even in the sixth Age P. *Gregory* declared, That though they might be in the Church, yet they ought not to be worshipped. Nor was there any contest about it, before the eighth Century. This being thus examined, and found to be True, then according to the foregoing Answer, that Decision was of no force, though made by the second Council of *Nice*. In a word,

word, if this Maxime be true, That Councils are only to be ſubmitted to, when they decree according to Apoſtolical Tradition, then they have no Authority in themſelves: and their deciſions can have no more force than this, That it may ſeem probable that they were not miſtaken, and in an Ignorant Age, even this probability will vaniſh to nothing.

No Body will reject the Deciſion of a Council, when the Decrees are juſt and right: But if it be upon that ſcore alone, that they are to be ſubmitted to, then none are bound by them, before they have examined them: And if upon a Search it appear they decreed againſt Tradition, then their Decrees are to be rejected. So it is apparent this Anſwer does plainly, according to their Principles, lay the foundation of all Hereſie; ſince it gives every Man a right to queſtion the Decrees of a General Council.

Beſides, How can thoſe Perſons be aſſured, that the fourth Council of *Lateran* did not decree according to Tradition? The Acts of that Council are loſt: ſo we cannot know upon what reaſons they made their Decrees. And it cannot be ſaid, that becauſe there is no mention made of any Tradition in the Decree, that therefore they conſidered none. It is ſeldom found that the reaſons of any Decree are put with it. But we may reaſonably enough believe, that they followed the Method in this Council, that had been uſed in ſome former ones (particularly in the ſecond Council of *Nice*) which was this, a Writing was read, penned perhaps by the Pope, or a Patriarch, in which the Tradition of the Church was confidently alledged; and ſome Quotations were brought; and very oft out of ſome later Writers. The Paper was no ſooner read, than a loud and often repeated Shout of applauſe followed, without any further ſearch or canvaſing about theſe Authorities. And upon that the Decree was made. This was the practice both

of

of the second *Nicene*, and of some more ancient Councils; whose Journals are hitherto preserved; and where the Journals are lost, we have reason to believe they followed the same method: so that it is very probable there might have been some such Writing read in the Council of *Lateran*. And if they did not found their Decree upon Tradition, they were much to blame; for they had as venerable a Tradition, as either the second Council of *Nice*, or some other Councils had: a practice about 150 years standing from the days of *Pope Gregory* the VII. so that it is not to be denied but they had as good authority from Tradition, to make this Decree, as to make most of the other Decrees, on which they insist much, in the Books of Controversies that are written by them.

By the fourth Rule of judging about Tradition, the matter is yet much plainer: for if the generally received Belief of any Age of the Church, is a good Thread to lead us up to the Apostles times, then there needs no more be said. For it is certain, that for near four Ages together, this was the universally received Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. And the opposition that some Princes made to it was condemned as Heresy, Rebellion, and every thing that was evil. And it is remarkable, that both *Ockam* that wrote much for the Emperors cause against the *Pope*, and *Gerson* and *Almain*, no great favourers of Papal power, are cited by Cardinal *Perron*, as acknowledging the Ecclesiastical power of deposing, if a Prince were guilty of spiritual crimes. So that the Controversies in this matter that were managed between the Writers for the Popes and Emperors, were not, whether the Pope in cases of Heresy might depose a Prince? but were concerning two things very remote from this.

The one was, whether the Pope had a direct Temporal power over all Kings, by which as being Lord of the Fee, he could

could proceed upon any Cauſe whatſoever againſt a King, and take his Dominions from him. To this indeed *Gregory* the *7th* pretended tho more covertly, and *Boniface* the *8th* more avowedly. There was great Oppoſition made to this by many Writers; but at the ſame time they all agreed on it, as an undeniable Maxim, That the Pope had an indirect Power over Princes, by which in the Caſes of Hereſy he might excommunicate and depoſe them; nor was there ſo much as any Debate about it.

A ſecond thing about which there was ſome Controverſy was, whether the Particulars that fell under debate came within the Head of Hereſy, or not? So in the Caſe of Princes giving the Inveſtitures into Biſhopricks, the Pope brought it in within the Head of Hereſy, and condemned thoſe Perſons as *Simoniacks*. The Writers on the other ſide denied this, pretending it was a Civil Matter, and a right of the Crown. The like Debates fell in, when Princes were ſentenced on any other account. The Authority of the Sentence in the Caſe of Hereſy was not controverted; all the Queſtion was; Whether the Point under debate was Hereſy or not? And concerning theſe things, any who have read the Writings in the great Collection made of them by *Goldaſtus*, will receive an eaſy and full Satisfaction. By which it appears, that the Popes Power of depoſing Kings in the Caſe of Hereſy was the received Doctrine of the Church for ſeveral Ages, and by conſequence it muſt be looked on as derived down from the Apoſtles, If the Doctrine of any one Age of the Church can lead us backward in a certain Track to diſcover what it was in the Apoſtles days.

By the firſt Poſition about the Nature of Supreme Power, it is apparent, that in the Caſe of Hereſy, a Prince depoſed by the Pope, if he ſtands out againſt the Sentence, may be as lawfully killed as any Tory or Moſs-

Trooper, or Bantito, may be; for he is a Rebel againſt his Lord, and an Uſurper over the People, from that day forward. And therefore tho *Mariana* told a Secret too publickly, yet it cannot be denied to be a certain Conſequent of their Principles. It had been indeed more diſcreetly done to have ordered this only to be infuſed unto Peoples Conſciences, by their Confeſſors in ſecret. And for *Mariana*, tho the Book in groſs is condemned, as they give out, yet the Opinions ſet down in it are not cenſured. But (*a*) *Suarez* writing againſt K. *James*, tells him in plain Terms, *That a King, who is canonically depoſed, may be killed by any man whatſoever.* This was not only publiſhed with an ordinary Licenſe, but the whole Univerſity of *Alcala* declared every thing in it to be according to the Doctrine of the Church. *Valentia*, tho he diſguiſes it a little, yet ſays, *That an Heretical Prince may by the Popes Sentence be deprived of his Life.* (*b*) *Foulis* cites ten more Doctors for the ſame Opinion of killing Kings by private perſons.

(*a*) In regiam Maieſt. Br. l. 6. c. 4. ſect. 20, à quocunque privato poteris interfici.

In Thom. Tom. 3. Diſp. 151. q. 12. p. 2.

(*b*) *Romiſh Tre Jons*, l. 2. cap. 4.

I do not build upon the Aſſertions of theſe Jeſuits, as binding Authorities in that Church, but make uſe of them to ſhew, that ſome of their own eminenteſt Writers acknowledg the force of this Conſequence; which is indeed ſo evident, that nothing but good Manners, and ſome ſmall Care not to provoke Princes too much by ſuch bare-faced Poſitions, keeps others from aſſerting it. Few Princes are ſo tame as *Childeric* was, to go into a Monaſtery after they are depoſed. Therefore this Doctrine is but a lame proviſion for the Churches Security from Hereſie, if the Lawfulneſs of killing does not follow that of depoſing Kings. And it was ſo generally received, that it is told of *Gerſon*, that he was at great pains to get it declared that no private Cut-throat might kill a King, and that by conſequence it was only the

The Life of Gerſon *before his Works*, and Tom. 1. p. 375.

the Popes Prerogative to order them to be deſtroyed.

By the ſecond Poſition about the Nature of Supreme Power, that in extraordinary Caſes Forms of Law may be ſuperſeded; It is alſo clear, that tho we know nothing of any Sentence of Depoſition given out againſt the King, yet he is not a whit the ſafer, for he lies under an yearly Curſe every *Maundy Thurſday*. The Notoriouſneſs of his Hereſy will ſufficiently juſtify a particular Sentence, without any further Proceſs or Citation, according to the Maxims of the Canon Law. And there may be for ought we can know, as valid a Depoſition as Parchment and Lead can make it, already expeded. And if it be not yet done, we are ſure it may be done very ſuddenly, and will be done whenſoever they ſee any probability of Succeſs.

Bellarmine hath very ſincerely told us the Reaſon why Heretical Princes are not depoſed, becauſe the Church has not ſtrength enough to make ſuch a Sentence good, or does not think it expedient; that is to ſay, They will do it whenſoever they find a Prince who will execute the Sentence, and yet by that Conqueſt not grow ſo ſtrong, as by that means to turn the Ballance. So the two Conſiderations to which we owe our Security are, the want of Force, and the Fear of another Prince his becoming too powerful by the Conqueſt. But I muſt add, that *Bellarmine*, while he was a Jeſuite, had taught, that Heretical Princes were not to be depoſed, except they endeavoured to turn their people from the Faith: This was all his Bounty to them, of which we could not pretend to a Crumb, ſince there were ſuch Laws made againſt Popery among us. Yet when he became a Cardinal, he conſidered better of the Matter; ſo that in his Recognitions he retracts that, and ſays therein be followed *Durandus* his Opinion, who maintains it againſt *Aquinas*,

Recog. in lib. 5. de Rom. Pont.

but he thinks the latter was in the right, and says, *Even in that Case they may be deposed, only the Church does it not always; either because she wants Strength, or does not judge it expedient.* But he concludes, *If Princes endeavour to draw their Subjects from the Faith, they may and ought to be deposed.* So in our Case there is no Mercy to be expected, unless we repeal all Laws against that Religion.

But after all this there is another Device in the Canon-Law, called, *Ipso facto*, by which a Sentence is incurred immediately upon the doing of a Fact. This began in the Priviledges granted to Monasteries or Churches, in most of which this Clause is to be found, *That if any King or Prince, &c. did any thing contrary to these Priviledges, he thereby fell from his Power and Dignity.* Now that Heresy is one of the things upon which a Prince is *ipso facto* under Excommunication and Deposition, we have the Authority of Father (e) *Parsons*, or *Creswel*, who tells us, *That the whole School of Divines and Canonists agree in it*, and, *That it is certain, and of Faith, That a Prince falling from the Catholick Religion, and endeavouring to draw away others from it, does immediately fall from all his Power and Dignity, even before the Pope has pronounced any Sentence, and that his Subjects are free from their Oaths of Obedience, and may eject such an one as Apostate and Heretick.*

(e) *Philopater* p. 106, 107.

But there is a clearer Evidence for this; the great and famous College of the *Sorbon*, (seventy Doctors being present) when consulted, whether the People of *France* were not freed from their Obedience to *Henry* the third, upon his putting the Duke and Cardinal of *Guise* to death; they, before ever the Pope had given Sentence, declared, *That they were absolved from their Obedience, and might with a good Conscience make War upon him for the defence of the Catholick Faith.* Upon which the *Parisians* wrote

wrote to the Pope to desire the Confirmation of that Decision. From all which it appears, that if the deposing Power be in the Pope, the King is not a whit the safer, because we know nothing of any such Sentence pronounced against him.

And thus having made good and illustrated the Positions I laid down, against all the Exceptions which that small and condemned Party of *Widdrington*'s Followers make use of, to cover themselves from the Charge of Treason, that lies against their Church; I go next to lay open the Evidence, after which I shall leave it to every Man's Conscience to pass the Verdict.

There are in (*f*) Pope *Gregory* the Great's Works, four Priviledges granted; one to the Abbey of St. *Medard*, another to the Hospital, a third to the Nunnery, a fourth to St. *Martin*'s Church of *Autim*. In which after the Priviledges are granted, a Sanction is added in these words; *If any Kings*, &c. *shall endeavour to countervene this Writing, let him lose the Dignity of his Power and Honour*. Or shorter, in that of St. *Medard*, *Let him be deprived of his Dignity*. These are to be found both in all the MSS, and Printed Editions of that Popes Works. It is true, the first of these to Saint *Medard*'s Monastery, is looked on as a forged Piece, both by Cardinal *Perron*, *Sirmond*, and *Launoy*. But as it went for a true one till of late, and is still defended by others, *Baronius* in particular, concluding from thence for the Popes Power over Kings; so the other Priviledges are not denied to be true by any, except *Launoy* of late, for ought I know. These have been for above 600 years looked on as the Grants of that Pope. But this may seem a private Writing, and not of such force.

(*l*) Greg. M. l. 2 post. Ep. 38. lib. 11. Ep. 10, 11, 12. Siquis Regum, &c. contravenire tentaverit potestatis honorisque sui dignitate careat.—*in alio* honore suo privetur.

About 130 years after that, Pope (*g*) *Gregory* the 3*d* deposed *Leo* the Emperor, from all his Dominions in *Italy*,

(*g*) Baron. ad An. 730. n. 5.

Italy, becauſe he would not tolerate the Worſhip of Images. And if that ſingle Hereſie merited ſuch a Sentence what may we look for, among whoſe many imputed Errors this is but one, and none of the moſt conſiderable? Not many years after that, did his Succeſſor *Zacharias* upon a Meſſage he received from *France*, abſolve that Nation from their Oaths to *Childeric*, and ordered *Boniface* to Crown *Pepin* in his ſtead. And not long after that Pope *Adrian* gave the Empire of *Rome*, and of the Weſt to *Charles* the Great. As (*b*) *Bellarmine* proves from above 30 of the Hiſtorians of that time, and the Teſtimony of many Soveraign Princes. Yet theſe being dark Ages, in which there was more of Action than Diſpute, we do not find the Grounds laid down, on which thoſe Proceedings were founded. But the conſtant Maxim of the Papacy, was, once to begin a Practice, and then to find Arguments to defend it, among which the Practice it ſelf was no inconſiderable one; for he was a mean ſpirited Pope, that would in a Tittle fall ſhort of what his Predeceſſors had aſſumed. About 250 years after *Charles* the Great had aſſumed the Empire of the Weſt, there aroſe a Pope (*Gregory* the Seventh) that reſolved to make the moſt of his See that could be: and reckoning, That the Empire of the Weſt was the *Gift* of his *Predeceſſors*, and building on that known Maxim, That none can give that which they have not, he looked on the ſupreme Dominion of it, as one of the Perquiſites of the See, which he would by no means part with. And therefore in his (*i*) *Dictatis*, in which he aſſerts the ſeveral Branches of his Prerogative, theſe be three of them: *That the Pope only may uſe the Imperial Enſigns. That he may depoſe Emperours.* And, *That he can abſolve Subjects from their Fidelity to wicked Princes.* And to ſhew he was in earneſt in theſe Doctrines, he began ſoon

(*b*) *Bellar.* de Tranſ Imperii Romani.

(*i*) Dictatus l. 2. poſt Ep. 55.

to

to lay about him. His firſt Threatnings were againſt King *Philip* of *France*, who was a vicious Prince: In a Letter to the Biſhops of *France*, he requires them to admoniſh the King for his Faults, and if he did not mend them, to put the whole Kingdom under an Interdict: And if after all that he continued ſtill Diſobedient, he Swaggers out in theſe Words, (*k*) *We will have none to be ignorant, or doubtful, what we intend to do upon it; for by the help of God we will endeavour by all Means, to wreſt the Kingdom of* France *out of his Poſſeſſion.* But upon the ſubmiſſion of that King, theſe Threatnings came not to any effect: Yet he went on againſt the Emperor, *Hen.* the 4*th*, at the rate he had threatned the King of *France*. I need not tell what all the World knows: That he firſt Excommunicated and Depoſed the Emperor, in the Year 1076. Then upon his doing of Penance, he received him into his Favour. But upon new provocations he depoſed him a ſecond, a third, and fourth time, in the years 1080, 1081, and 1083. In all which he had the concurrence of ſo many *Roman* Councils, and ſet up againſt him, firſt *Rodolph*, after that *Herman*: as his Succeſſors did; firſt *Conrade*, and then *Henry*, that Emperor's unnatural Sons.

(*k*) Lib 2. Ep 5. ad Ep. France.

The proſecution of the Hiſtory, is needleſs to my Deſign. But in his Letter to *Herman*, Biſhop of *Mets*, (*l*) we meet with that which is more conſiderable. For there he largely juſtifies his Proceedings, which he grounds on the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, being given to St. *Peter*; and the power of Binding and Looſing joined to them. More places of Scripture he ſought nor, but his Succeſſor, (*m*) *Boniface* the 8*th*, made uſe of *Ecce duo Gladii*, and the power given to the Prophet *Jeremiah*, *Over Kingdoms, to Root out, Pull down, Deſtroy, Throw down, to Build, and to plant*: And they took

(*l*) Liv. 8. Ep. 21.

(*m*) Extra. de Major. & Obed *cap.* 1.

took it in great dudgeon, if any would compare a ſingle Prophet under the Law, to Chriſt's Vicar under the Goſpel. But *Gregory* goes on in his Proofs, to the Tradition of the Church: And ſays, The Fathers had often both in General Councils, and in their particular Writings acknowledged, That this Power was in the See of *Rome*; That it was the Mother and Head of all other Churches: That all matters were to be judged by it, from whoſe Sentence no Appeal could lye: Nor could there be a Review made of the Judgments paſſed in that See. And to confirm what he had aſſerted, he cites ſome Paſſages out of *Gelaſius*, and *Julius*, and that Clauſe in the Priviledges granted by *Gregory* the Great, formerly mentioned. So here he very fully and formally delivers the Tradition of the Church, and builds upon it. He alſo cites the Precedent of Pope *Zacharias*, his Depoſing *Childeric*, not for any fault he found in him, but becauſe he thought him not fit to Govern. From that he goes on to ſome Reaſons, (ſuch as they are) for the juſtification of his Proceedings. The Pope having thus declared the Tradition and Doctrine of the Church, it is not to be wondred at, if both the Schoolmen mixt it with the Inſtructions they gave their Scholars, and the Canoniſts made it a part of the Law of the Church. (*n*) *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, *Alexander Alenſis*, *Bonaventure*, *Durand*, *Peter of Aliac*, *John of Paris*, *Almain*, *Gabriel Biel*, *Henry of Ghant*, *John Driodo*, *John de Terre iremata*, *Albert Pighius*, *Thomas Waldenſis*, *Petrus de Palude*, *Cajetan*, *Franciſcus Victoria*, *Dominicus a Soto*, and many others, (in all 70 are reckoned by *Bellarmin*, but *Foulis* enlarges the number to 177, whom he cites, who) did formally aſſert it. *Aquinas* alſo taught it; tho' in ſome places he contradicted himſelf. But (*o*) *Boniface* the 8*th*, thought his Predeceſſors had

(*n*) Bellar. *de Pont. Rom. lib.* 5. *c.* 151.

(*o*) *Cuſpiman in vita* Albert.

had proceeded in this matter too cautiouſly, and therefore he went more roundly to work. In the Jubilee in the year 1300, He ſhewed himſelf the firſt day in the Pontifical Habit, but the ſecond day, he was clothed with the Imperial Habit, a naked Sword being carried before him, and cried out with a loud voice, *I am Pope and Emperor, and have both the Earthly, and Heavenly Empire.* This upon ſo publick an occaſion looks very like the Teaching the Church *Ex Cathedra:* But becauſe words vaniſhed into Air, he left it in writing, in theſe terms: (p) *We ſay and define and pronounce, that it is abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation for every humane creature, to be ſubject to the Biſhop of Rome.* This being put into the Text of the Canon Law, in which it is continued to this day; we cannot think it Strange that *Panormitan, Oſtienſis, Silveſter,* with all the other Canoniſts aſſert the Popes direct Dominion over all the World. And what can they ſay leſs, Believing him to be Chriſts Vicar on Earth, *to whom all Power in heaven and earth was given of his Father,* therefore the power in Heaven being judged enough for Chriſt to manage himſelf, they thought all the power in Earth was Committed to the Vicar. This paſſed down without Contradiction among them, but was not received by the reſt of the Church: yet the Indirect, or as they termed it, the Eccleſiaſtical power in caſes of Hereſie was Univerſally agreed to: not one perſon Oppoſing it, till *Luther* and his Followers came, ſawcily to look into the Popes Title to this, and many other pretended Rights of the See of *Rome.*

(p) *Cap. de Major. ut Obed. Exter.*

But becauſe the Plea for an Indirect Power, was not Sufficient, Since if a Prince did not Favour Hereſie, it was of no uſe: And the pretention to a direct power was of an harſh ſound: Therefore a Title of another kind was ſet up. It was pretended, That all the Kingdoms

in the Weſtern and Northern parts of *Europe* were by formal Surrenders offered up to St. *Peter*, and St. *Paul*; And therefore whatever the Popes did, was ſaid to be done in Defence of their Rights; which made *Gregory* the 7th fly to them in that flanting Addreſs, with which he begins his Sentences againſt the Emperor.

Firſt of all, the Donation of *Conſtantine* the Great was forged: By which the Power of all the Weſt, *Italy*, *Sicily*, *Sardinia*, *Germany*, *France*, *Spain*, and *England*, were given to the Pope. This was put into the Text of the Canon Law: and was ſtood to, by all the Canoniſts. It is true the Civilians wrote generally againſt it. Among whom *Bartholus* may be reckoned, for in his Preface to the *Digeſts* having mentioned the Opinions of ſome againſt it, when it comes to his own, he delivers it thus; *Take notice that we are now in the Territory of the Church* (for he taught at *Bulloigne*) *and therefore I ſay that Donation is valid.* But till *Valla* diſcovered the Impoſtures of it ſo manifeſtly, that they are now aſhamed to maintain it any longer, their plea from it was never laid down. But *Auguſtinus Steuchus*, who undertakes the Vindication of that Donation againſt *Valla*, does likewiſe alledge from ſome Inſtruments in the *Vatican*, that both the Kingdoms of *Spain*, *Arragon*, *France*, *England*, *Denmark*, *Muſcovy*, *Sicily*, and *Croatia* and *Dalmatia*, did Subject their Crowns to the See of *Rome*. (b) *Krantzius* tells us, that *Lakold* King of *Poland*, made it Tributary to *Rome*. And for the *German* Empire, tho *Steuchus* ſays nothing of it, perhaps that he might not offend *Charles* the 5th, yet there is both in the Canon Law, and the Letters of Popes, more to be ſaid upon that Head, than for any of the reſt. They pretend the Popes ſet up firſt the Empire of the Weſt: Then gave the Princes of *Germany* the Right of chooſing the Emperor, and does ſtill give the Imperial

(b) *In Vandal* l. 8. c. 2.

perial Crown, upon the Emperors Swearing an Oath of Homage to them, according to the verſe under that Inſolent Picture ſet up by Pope *Innocent* the 2d. In the *Lateram* (r) of the Emperor lying proſtrate at his feet, and receiving the Crown from him.

(r) *Chron. Hirſaug. in vita Abb. Hartingi.*

Poſt homo ſit Papæ, ſumit quo dante Coronam.

But all theſe Surrenders were made uſe of only to ſtrengthen the great pretention they had of being Chriſts Vicars, and St. *Peters* Succeſſours; which from the end of the 11th Century, till the beginning of the 16th. for above 4 Ages together was as Authoritatively aſſerted by Popes, as poſitively taught by Divines, and as tamely received by the whole Church, Emperors and Kings not preſuming to contradict it, as any other Article of Faith. And for proofs of this we need appeal to no other witneſſes than thoſe 3. great Cardinals *Baronius*, *Bellarmin* and *Perron*, who may be preſumed to have underſtood the Doctrine of their own Church, better than any body elſe.

The Firſt of thoſe, through his whole work ſtrains his Induſtry, to diſcover as many Inſtances as he can of it: and never parts with any without expreſſing the particular ſatisfaction he had in ſo pleaſant a Diſcovery. I ſhall only ſet down what he ſays on the two 1ſt. occaſions that he met with. When he takes notice of *Gregory* the Great's priviledges formerly mentioned, he adds, (f) *You ſee Reader, That the Popes can make Laws, to which if Kings themſelves do not yield Obedience, they ſhall loſe their Kingdoms.* Upon the firſt Depoſition m de by *Gregory* the 3d. He adds, (t) *The Faithful in the Weſt being awakened by this Thunder, do immediately fall from the Obedience to* Leo, *adhering to this Apoſtolical Pope. So this*

(f) *Bar. ad Ann.* 593. *Num.* 86.

(t) *Bar. ad An.* 730. *Num.* 5.

Gregory *left a worthy Precedent to Poſterity, that Heretical Princes, be not ſuffered to reign in the Church of Chriſt, if having been often admoniſhed, they continue to perſiſt obſtinately in their Errors.* Such ſtrains as theſe do ſo often occur afterwards, that they can ſcarce be reckoned. It is well known what advice he gave P. *Paul* the 5th in the quarrel with the *Venetians*, applying the voice to St. *Peter, Ariſe and Kill*, to the caſe in hand; and that, with his Inſolent *Paræneſis* to that *Republick*, are clear Evidences of his ſence in this matter. What *Bellarmin* taught more ſhortly and obſcurely in his Controverſies, was afterwards made more plain both by his Writings, about the Tranſlation of the *Roman* Empire, upon the Interdict of *Venice*, and againſt King *James*, and *William Barklay*: And Cardinal *Perrons* Eloquent ſpeech againſt the Bill put in by the Third Eſtate of *France*, for Condemning thoſe pretenſions of a Depoſing Power, ſhews us not only his own ſenſe, but the ſenſe of the whole Clergy of *France*; in whoſe name he delivered it. (*u*) He calls the Contrary Opinion, *a Doctrine that breeds Schiſms, a Gate that leads unto all Hereſie, and ſo deteſtable, that he and his Fellow Biſhops will chooſe to burn at a Stake rather than conſent to it.* He affirming *That all the parts of the Catholick Church, and of the Church of* France *in particular, and all the Schools of Divinity, till the coming of* Calvin, *held the affirmative*, and ſays, *That no where in* France *ſince the Divinity Schools were ſet up, can they find any one Doctor, Divine, or Lawyer, any Decree, Council, or Sentence of Parliament, or any one Magiſtrate Eccleſiaſtick, or Politick, who had held that in caſe of Hereſie or Idolatry, Subjects might not be abſolved from their Oaths of Fidelity to their Princes.* It is true, at firſt he ſpake more modeſtly, and pretended the thing was problematical, and ſo was not fit matter for an Oath: but when that modeſter

(*u*) In his *Diverſes Oevres* and *Recueil General des Affaires du Clerge de France.*

ſter Strain (tho it tended all to depreſs the Regal, and exalt the Papal Power) had ſo far prevailed with the King, that he ordered the matter to be laid aſide, and not to be further inſiſted on. They were not ſatisfied with this, but made a new Addreſs in the Name of the Clergy; and the Cardinal ſpake now in a higher tone, aſſerting formally the Popes indirect Power in Temporals; and that all who maintained the contrary were Schiſmaticks, and Hereticks, even thoſe of the Parliament it ſelf; and did plainly threaten the King, That if he did not raze all the Proceedings out of the Regiſter, the Clergy would leave the Aſſembly, and Excommunicate all who denied the Popes Power of Depoſing. And if the King would not ſuffer them to execute theſe Cenſures, they would proceed upon their hazard tho they were to ſuffer Martyrdom for it. For which zeal, they received a Breve from the Pope, giving them his ſolemn Thanks for what they had done; deſiring them to perſevere in the ſame mind. So we have in this Inſtance, not only Cardinal *Perrons* own mind, but the ſenſe of the whole Clergy of *France*.

I do not think it neceſſary to enquire further into the opinion of later Writers; tho it were eaſie to ſhew, that to this day, both the Court of *Rome*, the whole Order of the Jeſuites, the Writers both of Controverſies, and Caſes of Conſcience, and the Expoſitors of Scripture, do as oft as occaſion offers, aſſert the power of Depoſing Kings to be ſtill in the See of *Rome*. And tho ſome few Writers of that Religion, ſince *Barkelay* and *Widdrington*'s time, both of the *Engliſh* and *Iriſh* Nation, have adventured to deny this power; they have been cenſured for it, and branded with Hereſy. This has been ſo notorious in the matter of the Iriſh Remonſtrance, that I need ſay no more of it.

But

But whether the Writers of this Age allow it or not, they are bound according to their Doctrine about Tradition, to acknowledg it; ſince two of the Characters of Tradition are found to agree to it. For it has been delivered in ſeveral Ages of the Church, as true Catholick Doctrine by all the publick Doctors in theſe times: ſo that either This is a Tradition of the Church, or That is not a true mark of Tradition: nor is it a certain conveyance of Truth, if we may be thus deceived in a clear Tradition, for four Ages ſucceſſively. It does alſo appear, that if the See of *Rome* be a faithful Depoſitary and Tranſmitter of Church Traditions, this muſt be one, ſince it is delivered to the world by ſo many Popes in the names of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, and founded on the *Power of the Keys*, and *of Binding and Looſing* granted to St. *Peter*.

But I ſhall next ſhew how the third mark of Tradition, the Authority of General Councils, agrees to this Doctrine. When this Doctrine had been ſo well ſpread over *Europe*, then the Popes found it was ſafe, to truſt it to the judgment of ſuch an Aſſembly as they eſteemed a General Council. And they proceeded in this matter, after the ſame manner that they had done in the worſhip of Images: and as they did afterwards in the points of Tranſubſtantiation, and denying the Chalice in the Communion. They took care firſt to infuſe it into all the Clergy, (which God wot's was no hard thing) and then brought them together, and made up the Pageant of a Council, for giving it more authority. So above an hundred years after *Gregory* the VII. had firſt taught this Doctrine, a thing under the name of a General Council ſate in the *Lateran* at *Rome*, where, upon the advantage the Popes had againſt the *Albigenſes* and others, who were according to their Opinion moſt peſtiferous Hereticks; they firſt procured a Decree for it. It is true, many Provincial

vincial Councils had concurred with *Gregory* the VII. (one of theſe is called a General one, 110 Biſhops being preſent) and the other Popes who had formerly given out theſe Thunders: But now the matter was to be more ſolemnly Tranſacted.

In this Council many Hereticks are condemned and Excommunicated; *and all that had ſworn Oaths of Fidelity or Homage to them, are Abſolved from thoſe Oaths: and they are required in order to the obtaining the Remiſſion of their ſins, to fight againſt them: and thoſe who die doing penance in that manner, may without doubt expect Indulgence for their ſins, with eternal rewards.* And in concluſion, *by the authority of St.* Peter *and St.* Paul *they Remit to all who ſhall riſe and fight againſt them, two years Penance.* Here the Council does induſtriouſly infuſe this Doctrine into all people; and calls Rebellion *Penance* (a very eaſy one to a poor or diſcontented Subject) and aſſures them of a deliverance from Purgatory, and that they ſhould be admitted ſtraight to Heaven for it. In an Age in which theſe things were believed, more effectual means than thoſe could not be found out, to engage the people in it. *Conc. Late. 3. Chap. 27. anno 1287. Tom 28.*

By this Decree, if we are guilty of the Hereſies then condemned, (as no doubt we are of moſt of them) without more ado, or any further Sentence, upon the declaring us guilty of the Hereſies of the *Albigenſes*, the Subjects are delivered from their obligations to the King. And when they conſpire or rebel againſt him, they are only doing penance for their ſins; and he were hard-hearted that would puniſh men only for doing of penance.

About thirty years after that Council, the Pope had a mind to regulate the former Law, That the Depoſing of Kings might be declared a part of his Prerogative; and

that

that thereby he might with authority Diſpoſe of their Kingdoms to others. For hitherto the Popes had only pretended to the Power of Depoſing, and then the States of the Kingdom as in an Interregne, were to chooſe a new Prince. But P. *Innocent* the III. thought it was half work, except he could beſtow, as well as take away Crowns. His Predeceſſor *Celeſtine* had in a moſt extravagant humour ſet the Crown on *Henry* the Sixth his head, with his two feet, and then kickt it off again; to ſhew, according to *Barronius* his Comment, *That it was in his power to give, to maintain, and take away the Empire.*

Conc. Later. 4. Can. 3. Tom. 28. The ſame Council that eſtabliſhed Tranſubſtantiation.

A very full Aſſembly therefore being called of about 1200 of one ſort or other to the *Lateran* again, It was firſt Decreed, *That the aid of Secular Princes ſhould be required for the Extirpating of Hereticks*; after that they proceed and enact thus. *When the Temporal Lord required or admoniſhed by the Church, ſhall neglect to purge his Territory from Heretical wickedneſs, let him be Excommunicated by the Metropolitan and his Suffragans. And if he perſiſt in neglecting to give ſatisfaction for the ſpace of a year, let him be ſignified to the Pope: That he from thenceforth may pronounce his Subjects diſcharged from their Obedience; and expoſe his Territory to be ſeized on by Catholicks, who having exterminated the Hereticks, ſhall poſſeſs it without contradiction, and preſerve it in the purity of the Faieh; ſo as no injury be done to the Right of the Supreme Lord, where there is ſuch, provided he do not any way oppoſe himſelf: and the ſame Law is to take place on them, who have no Superiour Lord.*

The Depoſition of the Court of *Tholouſe*, being the thing then in their eye, made that the Decree runs chiefly againſt Feudatary Princes, yet as the laſt Clauſe takes in Soveraign Princes, ſo by the Clauſe before, it was provided, *That if the Soveraign did any way Oppoſe what*

was

was done againſt his Vaſſal, he was to forfeit his Right. I did in the former part of this Letter, meet with all the Exceptions that are commonly made to this Canon. Only one pretty Anſwer which a perſon of Honour makes, is yet to be conſidered. He tells us, that there were ſo many Soveraign Princes, or Ambaſſadors from them, at this Council, that we are to look on this Decree, as a thing to which thoſe Princes conſented. From whence he Infers, It was rather their Act, than an Invaſion of their Rights made by that Council. But be it ſo, he knows they allow no Preſcription againſt the Church. If then thoſe Princes conſented to it, upon which the power of Depoſing had that Acceſſion to fortifie it by, it can never be recalled nor preſcribed againſt. It is true there were many Ambaſſadors from Princes there: But they were all ſuch as either held their Dominions by the Popes Grant, or had been either Depoſed by him, or Threatned with Depoſitions, or were the Children of thoſe whom he had Depoſed. So no wonder they ſtood in ſuch fear of the Pope, that they durſt not refuſe to conſent to every thing he had a mind to. For indeed this Council did only give their *Placet* to a paper of Decrees penned by the Pope.

Henry called the *Greek* Emperor, Brother to *Baldwin*, that had ſeized on *Conſtantinople*, had no other Title to it beſides the Popes Gift. *Frederick* the 2d, who had been the Popes Ward, was then the Elect Emperor of *Germany*, made ſo at the Popes Inſtance, who had Depoſed the two Immediately preceding Emperours, *Philip* and *Otho* the 4th. the laſt being at that time alive; So that he durſt not contradict the Pope, leſt he ſhould have ſet up *Otho* againſt him. But no Emperor, except *Henry* the 4th, ever ſuffered more from the Popes Tyranny, than he did afterwards. One ſad Inſtance of it was, that the Pope having

preſſed his March to the Holy-land much, did at laſt Excommunicate him for his delays: upon which, he to avoid further cenſures, carried an Army thither: which was ſo ſucceſful, that the Pope who hoped he ſhould have been deſtroyed in the Expedition, (as the firſt Emperor of that name was) now being vexed at his Succeſs, complained that he ſhould have preſumed to go thither, while he lay under Excommunication, and was in Rebellion againſt him; and went about not only to Dethrone him, but to get him to be betrayed by the Knights Hoſpitallers, and Templers, into the Sultans hands, who abominating that Treachery, revealed it to him.

John of *Brenne* had the Kingdom of *Jeruſalem* by that ſame Popes Gift, who took it from *Almeric* King of *Cyprus*, and gave it him; But *Almeric* had no cauſe to complain, ſince he held *Cyprus* only by the ſame Copy of the Popes Gift: So they both were at the Popes Mercy. Our *John* of *England* was his Vaſſal, as he uſually called him; But his Succeſſour went higher, calling the King of *England* not only his Vaſſal, but *his Slave*; and Declared *That at his beck he could procure him to be Impriſoned, and Diſgraced.* *James* King of *Arragon*, who was alſo the Popes Ward, had no leſs reaſon to be afraid of the Pope, who had Depoſed his Father for Aſſiſting the Count of *Thelouſe*. *Philip Auguſtus* King of *France*, had his Kingdom twice put under an Interdict, worſe things being alſo threatned. The like Threatnings had been made to *Andrew* King of *Hungary*, but upon his Submiſſion he was received into favour.

Math. Paris. ad An. 1253.

And now is it any wonder, that thoſe Princes gave way to ſuch a Decree, when they knew not how to help themſelves by Oppoſing it, which would have raiſed a Storm, that they could not hope to weather?

Another thing is remarkable concerning this time, by which

which the Belief of the Depoſing Doctrine in that Age will better appear. Other Princes whom Popes had Depoſed, procured ſome Civilians to write for them; and got Synods of Biſhops ſometimes on their ſide againſt the Pope. Becauſe it was evident the Pope proceeded not upon the Account of Hereſie, but of private ſpite and hatred. But in the caſe of the Count of *Tholouſe*, who was a manifeſt Favourer of that, which was eſteemed Hereſie, (the Opinions of the *Albigenſes* that were his Subjects) not a Writer in all that Age durſt undertake to defend his cauſe, nor could he procure one Biſhop to be of his ſide. So univerſally was it received, that in the caſe of Hereſie, a Prince might be Depoſed by the Pope.

The 3d General Council that Confirmed this Power, was the Council of *Lions*, held by *Innocent* the 4th againſt the forementioned *Frederick* the 2d, where (as the Sentence bears) *The Pope having Conſulted with his Brethren and the Holy Council, being Chriſts Vicar on Earth, to whom it was ſaid in the perſon of St.* Peter, *whatſoever ye bind on Earth, &c. Declares the Emperor bound in his ſins, and thereupon Deprived by God of his Dominions. Whereupon he by his Sentence does Depoſe him, and abſolves all from their Oaths of Fidellty to him Straitly charging all perſons, to acknowledge him no more either Emperor or King. Declaring all that did otherwiſe, Excommunicated* ipſo facto. There are in this Proceſs ſeveral things very remarkable. It is grounded on a pretence to a Divine Tradition; So here the whole Council concur with the Pope, in aſſerting this power to flow from that Conveyance. And thus either that Tradition is true, or the Councils are not to be believed when they Declare a Tradition. 2ly. Tho this is but a Decree in one particular Inſtance, yet it is founded on the General Rule; And ſo is a Confirmation of it, by which it is put out of doubt, that the 4th Council of *Lateran* included Soveraign Prin-

Conc. Lugd. Tom. 28.

es within their Decree. 3ly, When the Emperors Advocate appeared to plead for him; He did not at all except to their Jurisdiction over him, or Power of Deposing in the case of Heresie, but denyed that the Emperor was guilty of the crimes Objected, namely Heresie, whereby he, at least, waved the denial of their Power in that case. He also desired some time might be granted for the Emperor to appear and plead for himself in person. Whereby he plainly acknowledged their Jurisdiction. 4ly When the Ambassadors of *France* and *England*, Interceded that the Emperors desire might be granted; the Council gave him near two weeks time to appear in: which was so incompetent a time, and all had declared themselves so prepossest, or rather so overawed by the Pope that hated him Mortally; That the Emperor would not appear because they were his professed Adversaries. And upon that, and other grounds (none of them touching on the power of Deposing in cases of Heresie) He appealed from them, to the next General Council; Upon which the Pope and Prelates sitting in Council, with Candles burning in their hands, thundred out the Sentence against him.

Here were three very publick Judgments, of three General Councils on this Head, within the compass of sixty years. But it may be imagined, these were Councils that wholly depended on the Pope; and so their Decrees are to be looked on, only as a Ceremony used by the Pope to make his own Sentence look more solemn. But when upon the long Schism in the See of *Rome*, the power of that See was much shaken, and a Council met at *Constance* to heal that Breach; in which the Bishops taking advantage from that Conjuncture, to recover their former Dignity, began to Regulate many matters. It may be, upon such an occasion, expected, that if any Party in the Church had disliked these practices, they should have been

been now condemned; and that the rather, since by so doing, the Bishops might have hoped to get the Princes to be of their side, in their Contests with the Pope. But it fell out quite otherwise. For as the Murtherers of his late Sacred Majesty pretended, when the King was killed, that all his power was devolved on them, and would have even the same precedence allowed their Ambassadors in forreign parts, that his had: So the Council of *Constance* reckoned, that whatever Rights the Popes had assumed, did now rest with them, as the Supreme Power of the Church. For in one of their Sessions, a Decree was framed, made up of all the severe Decrees that had ever been made, against those who violated the Rights of the Church: And this Clause often returns, *That all the Breakers of these Priviledges, whether they were Emperors, Kings, or whatsoever other Degree, were thereby*, ipso facto, *subjected to the Bans, Punishments, and Censures set down in the Council of* Lateran. *Conc. Const. Tom. 29. Sess. 19.* And tho they do not call it the Fourth Council, yet we are sure it could be no other; for they relate to that in which *Frederick* the 2d. was consenting to, which was the fourth in the *Lateran* And in another Decree, by which they hoped to have set up a Succession of General Councils, at evety ten years end; this Clause is added, *That if any person, whether of the Papal* (for they had subjected the Pope to the Council, and had more reason to fear his opposing this Decree, than any Bodies else) *Imperial or Regal Dignity, &c. should presume to hinder any to come to the next General Council, he is declared to be first Excommunicated, then under an Interdict, and then to be subject to further punishment both Temporal and Spiritual.* *Sess. 15.* And in the Pass they gave the King of the *Romans*, to go to the King of *Arragon*, they add this Sanction, *That whatever person, whether King, Cardinal, &c. do hinder him in his Journey, he is* ipso facto, *deprived of all Honour, Dignity, Office, or Benefice, whether* *Sess. 17.*

Eccle-

Eccleſiaſtical or Secular. So here the indirect power over Princes, by which they may be both depoſed and puniſhed, is plainly aſſumed. It is true that ſame Council did indeed Decree, That no Subject ſhould murther his King or Prince; upon which ſome of our *Engliſh* and *Iriſh* Writers, who condemn theſe practices, think they have great advantages. That Decree was procured by *Gerſons* means, who obſerving that by the many Rebellions that had been generally ſet on by Popes, the Perſons of Princes were brought under ſuch contempt, that private Aſſaſſinations came to be practiſed: and in particular that of the Duke of *Orleance* by the Duke of *Burgundy*. Therefore to prevent the fatal conſequences which were like to follow on that, and to hinder ſuch practices for the future, he with great earneſtneſs followed that matter: And tho it had almoſt coſt him his life (it is like from ſome of the Duke of *Orleance* his Faction, who were reſolved on a Revenge) yet at laſt he procured it: But this was only a Condemnation of private Cut-throats. And the Article condemned had a pretty Reſervation in it, for it ſtrikes only againſt Subjects killing their Prince, *without waiting for the Sentence of any Judg whatſoever.* So if a Sentence be paſt by the Spiritual Judg, then this Condemnation notwithſtanding, a Prince may be Murthered. And the other Decree of that Council paſſed in the ſame Seſſion, ſhew they had no mind to part with the Depoſing Power. Beſides the Anſwer to this Decree is clear. It is acknowledged by the Defenders of the contrary opinion, That it is not lawful in any caſe to kill a King; but when one that was a King is no more ſuch, but becomes a Rebel and an Uſurper, then it is lawful to kill him.

Seſſ. 15.

Con. Sien. Tom. 29.

Purſuant to the Decree made at *Conſtance*, a Council met at *Siena* ten years after, in which all the former Decrees made againſt Hereticks are confirmed, and the Favourers or *Fautors* of Hereſie are delared liable to all the

pains

pains and censures of Hereticks, and by consequence to the chief of them all, *Deposition*.

After that came the Council of *Basil*, which ratified the forementioned Decree made at *Constance* about General Councils. By which Popes, Emperors, Kings, &c. that presumed to hinder any from coming to the Council, are subjected to Excommunication, Interdicts and *other Punishments Spiritual and Temporal.* *Con. Basil Tom. 29.*

Last of all came the Council of *Trent*, and tho matters were at that pass, that the Council durst not tread on Princes, as others had formerly done, lest they should have been thereby provoked to join with the Protestants; yet they would not quite lay aside the pretence of a Deposing power, but resolved to couch it so into some Decree, that it might continue their claim to a Right, which they would not part with, tho they knew not at that time what to make of it. So in the Decree against Duels, they declare, *That if any Emperors, Kings,* &c *did assign a field for a Combat, that they did thereby lose their Right to that place, and the City, Castle, or other places about it.* Now it is certain, if by their Decrees a Prince may forfeit any part of his Dominion, he may be also dispossessed of all the rest; since his Title to his whole Territory being one individual thing, what shakes it in any part, subjects it entirely to him who has such authority over it. *Conc. Trid. Sess. 25 c. 19.*

Here we have found 7 General Councils, as they are esteemed by that Church, all either expressly asserting the Deposing Power, or ratifying former Decrees that had asserted it. And from such a succession of Councils, it is reasonable to conclude, That this Third Character of a Tradition of the Church agrees to it; and if General Councils are fit Conveyors of Traditions, we have as full Evidence as can be desired, for proving this to be a Church-Tradition.

This last Character of a Tradition is what the whole Body

Body of the Church has held in any one Age. Upon which, they ſay, we may calculate that ſuch opinions muſt have come down from the Apoſtles, ſince it ſeems neither credible nor poſſible, that the Belief of the Church could be changed. With this *Arnold* has of late made great noiſe. And as the new Faſhions that come from *France* do pleaſe our young Gallants beſt, ſo ſome of the Writers of Controverſies among us have taken up the ſame plea here. That the whole Church received the Depoſing Doctrine in caſes of Hereſy, may be inferred from what had been ſaid. The Church is made up of Popes, Biſhops, & Prieſts: Of Soveraign Princes, and Subjects of all ranks. That the Popes believed it, none can doubt. So many Definitions of Councils, ſhews us as plainly what the Biſhops and other Prelates believed: the Writing of the Schoolmen and Canoniſts ſhew, what the reſt of the Clergy believed. Thoſe Princes who ſuffered under the Sentences, give at leaſt a tacit conſent to it, ſince they never queſtion it, but ſtudy only to clear themſelves of the imputation of Hereſie. The other Princes who made uſe of the Donations of the Popes, ſhew as plainly that they believ'd it. The great Armies that were brought about their Standards, muſt have alſo believed it: and the people who generally deſerted the Depoſed Prince, notwithſtanding the great vertues of ſome of them, and the love that Subjects naturally carry to their Princes, ſhew that they believed it. So that if St. *James* his Queſtion, *Shew me thy Faith by thy Works*, be applied to this particular, the Anſwer will be eaſie. What ſhall I mention the frequent depoſitions of *Charles* the 1ſt, of *Henry* the 4th, of his Son *Henry* the 5th, of *Frederick* the 1ſt, *Philip*, *Otho* the 4th, *Frederick* the 2d, and *Lewis* the 4th in the Empire. The frequent Depoſitions in *Sicily* and *Naples*; the many attempts upon *France*; that terrible Bull in particular of *Julius* the 2d, againſt that good King *Lewis* the twelfth.

By

By which, beſides the Sentence againſt the King, it appears he deſigned the total deſtruction of the Nation, promiſing the Pardon of Sin to every one that killed one *French* Man; the freqnent Attempts upon *England*, both in *Hen.* the 2d, and K. *John's* time; not to mention their later Bulls of Depoſition againſt K. *Henry* the 8th, and Q. *Elizabeth*; the many Attempts in *Spain*; particularly, the depoſing the King of *Navarre* by P. *Julius*; and the Sentences againſt *Henry* the 4th, then King of *Navarre*, and the Prince of *Conde*. All theſe, and a great many more, with the ſtrange Effects that followed upon them, are ſo clear Proofs of the Worlds believing this Doctrine, for many Ages together, that if Men had any Remainders of ſhame left with them, they could not deny it. And to this day all their Writers maintain it, tho perhaps now the greateſt part of the Laity know little of it; but whenever the Tradition of the Church is laid before them, they are obliged to ſubmit, or they fall from the Catholick Faith, the chief Branch of which is, To believe all the Traditions of the Church. And ſince the Church is the ſame in all Ages, according to their Doctrine, the Traditions of any one Age muſt be as good as the Traditions of any other can be, all being grounded on the ſame Authority.

Bud. de Aſſe lib. 5.

And now let all the Reaſons that *Arnold* brings to prove, from the Churches believing Tranſubſtantiation in any Age, that ſhe muſt have always believed it, be conſidered, and applied with a ſmall variation of the Terms to this Purpoſe; and we ſhall ſee if they conclude not as ſtrongly in favour of this Doctrine, as for that which he has purſued ſo much. *How can it be imagined*, ſays he, *that a Doctrine ſo contrary to common Sence and Reaſon, could have been ſo univerſally received, if every Man had not been taught it by thoſe who inſtructed him in the*

Faith? Will Men eaſily change their Faith? Or, tho particular Perſons would prevaricate, would the whole Clergy conſpire to do it? Or would the People take it eaſily off their hands. Theſe and many more Topicks of that ſort may be ſo muſtered up, and ſet off by a Man of Wit and Eloquence, that an ordinary Perſon would ſtare, and not know what to ſay. The Premiſes will ſhew, that there is need but of very little Art to change the ſame Plea, and fit it to this purpoſe, with two great advantages beyond what can be fanci'd to be in the other. The one is, that the generality of Mankind is naturally more concerned in the preſervation of Temporal things, than about nice points of Speculation; the one they ſee and handle every day, and are much concerned about; the other they hear little of, and are not much touched with them. So that it is leſs probable there could be a change made in opinions, on which the Titles of Princes, and the Peace of Kingdoms depended, than about ſubtil Diſcourſes concerning Myſteries. So that the Plea is ſtronger for the Tradition of depoſing Kings, than for Tranſubſtantiation. A ſecond Difference is, That there was a continual Oppoſition made to the belief of Tranſubſtantiation in all Ages, which they themſelves do not deny, only they ſhift it off the beſt they can, by calling the Oppoſers Heretick's; but for the depoſing Doctrine, there was not one Perſon in the whole World, that preſumed to bring it in queſtion, from the firſt time it was pretended to, till thoſe whom they call Hereticks diſputed againſt it; and tho ſome few others, who hold Communion with them, have ventured on a canvaſing of that Doctrine, it is well enough known what thanks they got from *Rome*; nor can they ſhew any one Book, licenſed according to the Rules of their Church, that denies it. And thus the Plea for this Doctrine has a double Advantage

vantage beyond that for Tranſubſtantiation.

Upon the whole matter then, if Tradition be a ſure Conveyance, and if we may pronounce what is truly a Tradition, either from the Opinions of Doctors, the Conſtitutions of Popes, the Decrees of General Councils, and the univerſal Conſent of the whole Church for ſome Ages; then the Doctrine of depoſing Kings, to which all theſe agree, muſt be reckoned among Church-Traditions. There is but one other Mark that can be deviſed of a Tradition, which is, What the Church has taught and believed in all Ages; but for a certain Reaſon, which they know very well, they will not ſtand to that. They know we do not refuſe ſuch Traditions, and if only ſuch may be received, then the Worſhip of Images, the Prayers to Saints, the Worſhip in an unknown Tongue, the Belief of Tranſubſtantiation, the Sacrifice of the Maſs, the denying the Chalice to the Laity, the redeeming Souls out of Purgatory, with many other things of the like nature, will be ſoon taken off of the File. And indeed in this ſence, the depoſing Doctrine is ſo far from being a Tradition, that we have as undeniable Evidences, that the Church for the firſt ſix Ages knew nothing of it, but on the contrary abhorred the thoughts of it, as we have, that their Church theſe laſt ſix Ages has ſet it up: From which, among many other Reaſons, we conclude, that theſe latter Ages have not been acted with the ſame Spirit, nor followed the ſame Doctrine, that was the Rule of the former Ages.

There is more than enough ſaid to ſhew, that theſe Doctrines are a part of their Faith; from which they can never extricate themſelves, but by confeſſing, either that their Church has erred, or that Tradition is no true Conveyance; when they do either of theſe, they turn their Backs on *Rome*, and are in a fair away to come over to our

Church, with which purpoſe I pray God inſpire them.

The mean while, it is no wonder, if thoſe of that Communion, have been guilty of ſuch horrid Plots and Rebellions every where, eſpecially in *England*, ſince *Henry* the 8th's time. There was in his Reign, Firſt a Rebellion in *Lincolnſhire*, another greater one in the North, and ſome leſſer ones after that. In *Edward* the 6th's time, there were Riſings, both in the North, and in the Weſt. But theſe ſucceeded ſo ill, and turned only to the ruine of their own Party, that they reſolved to try ſecreter ways in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time; in whoſe long and bleſſed Reign, there ſcarce paſſed one year in which there was not ſome Plot againſt her Life. There was not Matter enough to work upon, for raiſing any conſiderable Rebellion in *England*: But in *Ireland*, there were more frequent attempts that way. It is true, the Care and Providence of God was too hard for all their Plots, how cloſely ſoever laid; and they were turned back on themſelves, not ſo much to the ruine of the chief Plotters (who were wiſe enough to conveigh themſelves out of the way) as of many Noble Families, that were poyſoned with their ill Principles. All the Blood which the State was forced to ſhed, lies at their door, who were continually giving freſh Provocations. And for King *James* (not to mention the Conſpiracies againſt him in *Scotland*, nor that Plot of *Cobham* and *Watſon*, upon his firſt coming to this Crown) the Gun-powder Treaſon was a thing that went beyond all the wicked Deſigns that had been ever in any Age contrived. And when his late Majeſty was Embroiled in his Affairs in this Iſland, how did they take advantage from that Conjuncture, to break out into a moſt horrid Rebellion in *Ireland*, joyned with a Maſſacre of Perſons of whatſoever Age, or Sex, or Condition? Which was ſo far ſet on by

Rome,

Rome, that a Nuncio came publickly to direct their Councils. I will not dwell on Particulars that are ſufficiently known, but only name theſe things, to ſhew, That no Reign of any of our Princes, ſince the Reformation, has been free from the diſmal effects of theſe Doctrines. And for his Sacred Majeſty who now Reigns, (whom God long preſerve from their Malice) they have felt ſuch ſignal marks of his Royal Clemency, that they can have no colour to complain, except it be, becauſe they cannot bear any Office in the Nation. For what Noiſe ſoever they make, of the ſevere Laws yet in force, both againſt the Clergy and Laity of their Religion, they cannot pretend that ſince his Majeſties happy Reſtauration, any Prieſt has died, or any Family has been ruined for their Religion. But I confeſs, it is enough, according to the Doctrine of their Church, to diſcharge them of their Allegiance, That the King is a favourer of Hereſy; and if upon this Reaſon they will ſtill Plot and Conſpire againſt his Perſon and Government, we have no reaſon to wonder at it, for they act according to their Principles.

Nor have theſe Iſlands been the only Scenes, in which thoſe Principles have produced ſuch diſmal Effects. If we look abroad and reflect on what was done in *France*, we ſhall find, they have had the ſame Operation there. I need not mention that perfidious and cruel Maſſacre, that as *Thuanus* tells us was ſo much extolled in *Rome* and *Spain*: and of which the Pope has a Memorial kept in the Hangings, at the entrance of his Chappel, to this day. The Barricadoes of *Paris*, the deſign of Depoſing *Henry* the 3d, only becauſe he had made Peace with the King of *Navarre*, and the Prince of *Conde*; the whole progreſs of the holy League; their taking Arms againſt that King, when the Duke and Cardinal of *Guiſe* were

were killed by his Orders, and at last his being stabbed by *Clement*, a *Dominican* Friar, are Instances beyond exception. The prosecution of the Rebellion against *Henry* the 4th, the attempt made upon his Person by *John Chastel*, which was more successful in *Ravilliack*'s hands, shew sufficiently, That a Princes turning from that, which they call Heresie, over to their Church, does not secure him, unless he will extirpate Hereticks. For tho *Henry* the 4th changed his Religion, yet the favour he shewed the Protestants, in the Edict of *Nantes*, was a thing never to be forgiven. These things were set on and encouraged from *Rome*, and pleaded for by their Writers. That the holy League was authorized from *Rome*, that *Sixtus* the 5th, by his Bulls, declared the King of *Navar* incapable of the Succession; that he intended to have Deposed *Henry* the 3d, and that he rejoyced at his death, and magnified the Fact; preferring it to *Eleazar*'s killing the Elephant, and *Judeth*'s killing *Holofernes*, and ascribed it to a singular Providence and Disposition of the Almighty; called it a great Miracle, and appeared vain that a Friar had done it, having been one himself, (tho no doubt he had liked it better, if *Clement* had been of his own sute) and would have had himself thought a Prophet for foretelling it, (and so he might well do perhaps): and in the end concluded, That unfortunate Kings favouring Hereticks, to be the unpardonable Sin against the Holy Ghost: These were all so publickly done, that it were a needless labour, to go about the proving them. *Francis Veronne* wrote a Book, to justify both the Facts of *Clement* the Dominican, and *Chastel*, (as well he might from the Principles of their Church). After all these dismal Facts, was it not time for the States of *France*, to think of some effectual Remedy, to prevent the like for the future? And they judged aright, that without

without Condemning the Depoſing Power, it could not be done: To which, as was already hinted, the Clergy made ſuch vigorous Oppoſition, that it came to nothing.

Diſcuſſ. Decret. Con. Lateran. p. 46.

If theſe things had flowed only from the heat of ſome violent Spirits, the danger were not ſo great; but it is the Doctrine of their Church, ſo *Leſſius* (under the name of *Singletonus*) ſays, *That if the power of Depoſing lies not in the Pope, the Church muſt of neceſſity Err, which has taught it*; and to aſſert that, *is Heretical, and a more intollerable Error, than any about the Sacrament can be.* And *Becanus*, Confeſſor to *Ferdinand* the 2d, ſays, *No Man doubts, but if Princes are Contumacious, the Pope may order their Lives to be taken away.* What ſecurity then can there be found out from Perſons, who give up their Conſciences to the conduct of Men of ſuch Principles; and profeſs an Implicite Obedience and belief of all that their Church teaches and commands, which poſſeſſes all its Votaries with ſuch curſed rage againſt Hereticks, that not content to adjudg them to eternal Flames in another Life, they muſt needs Perſecute and Burn without Mercy where they have the Power in their Hands; and Plot and Conſpire, Kill and Maſſacre without relenting, where they have not Power to do it with any colour of Law?

Bec. *Controv. Angl.* p. 115.

Men of Honour will not be eaſily drawn in to ſuch Practices. But in Concluſion, when a fit Opportunity appears, they muſt either forſake their Church, or concur in the moſt miſchievous Deſigns, that the Maſters of their Conſciences will draw them into; which I pray God make them ſee in good time, before they are Involved in ſuch Snares, that Repentance will come too late to do them good, or to preſerve the Nation from thoſe Miſeries that they will bring upon it.

FINIS.